

From: Toppin@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:20 AM
Subject: MB Docket No. 02-277, et al

June 1, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,
Federal Communications Commission

RE: MB Docket No. 02-277 - 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996;

MM Docket No. 01-235 - Cross-Ownership of Broadcast Stations and Newspapers;

MM Docket No. 01-317 - Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple Ownership of Radio Broadcast Stations in Local Markets

As Chairman of Citizens Equal Rights Alliance (CERA), a national alliance of local and regional community education and action organizations, I write this eleventh hour plea that you and your colleagues gravely consider the net effect of decisions to be made on June 2, 2003. CERA opposes any further cross-media ownership that results in the following:

1. Unmanned radio stations across the country, unable to notify local and regional citizens regarding impending natural disaster or terrorist attacks;
2. Reduced or no ability for citizens to access and express public opinion using local media resources;
3. A monopoly or oligopoly of media resources positioned to shape, slant and propound one point of view, while simultaneously preventing reasonable debate or counterpoint information.

I note with some irony the substantial efforts made by the FCC to alert the general public as to precautions taken to protect FCC headquarters during "High" homeland security alert. This effort to protect one single building in Washington D.C. is prominent on the FCC website. Yet now, the FCC, by administrative fiat, is poised to undo existing early warning systems across Rural America, by facilitating monopolistic treatment of media resources whose primary purpose should be to serve public interest, let alone public safety. The FCC must not, in decisions made on June 2, 2003, lay bare any ability to notify the general public in local and regional areas, to protect THEIR buildings, businesses, homes and families.

Stifling public forum and debate is sufficient reason to rethink any further conglomeration of media resources; actual public safety arising from natural disasters and terrorist attack should be sufficient cause to suspend any further discussion on this matter.

Allowing mega-conglomerates to realize cost efficiencies by reducing or removing live personnel from regional radio, television and print resources portends an enormous public safety risk and long-term costs associated with loss of life for lack of timely homeland security information.

For a federal agency charged with protecting the public interest, the general public is hard pressed to locate any useful information on the FCC website, regarding a decision you may make on June 2, 2003 that will affect the lives of literally millions of Americans.

We believe that the near absence of public discussion or information on this pending FCC action, within mainstream media right NOW, is the best evidence of the folly of facilitating further mergers. Those who stand to gain by further mergers are the very entities currently stifling public discussion on this FCC matter of critical public import.

We would strongly encourage the FCC to deny, delay or at least substantially postpone an obvious economic decision, to afford time to consider public safety and public interest economics that will surely bring costly unintended consequences of any hasty decisions made by the FCC on June 2, 2003.

Sincerely,

CITIZENS EQUAL RIGHTS ALLIANCE

ELAINE D. WILLMAN,
Chair
P.O. 1280
Toppenish, WA 98948
Phone: 509-865-6225
Fax: 509-865-7409
Email: toppin@aol.com

From: Writerwrongnow@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, KM KJMWEB, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:32 AM
Subject: CONSIDER PUBLIC HEARING

I am writing to ask you to consider a public hearing regarding the changes that are about to take place on June 2, 2003. Americans deserve diversity in our media.

From: fstcaus
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:42 AM
Subject: 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - limit multiple ownership

I am writing to urge that you do not change government regulations concerning the number of TV stations a single entity can own. Rather, I hope the FCC will impose tighter limits on station ownership and expand it to the radio and internet.

Present regulations may be decades old, but the idea the airways should be open and free are still relevant now, more than ever.

Large companies do not improve diversity, quality, or local responsibility. The blandness, single mindedness, and diminished local relevancy of America's radio spectrum is a prime example.

With ownership concentrated to the very few, corruption becomes easier and the exchange of ideas suppressed.

The free TV networks certainly are facing more competition from cable, but in a capitalistic and free enterprise system that means the networks need to fight back with quality programming that is more desirable than cable, not special rules to help them survive from their own mediocrity. This is not a difficult decision. More independent owners competing against each other promotes quality and responsibility. Consolidation does the opposite.

Thank you for your time.

David Fritz

From: Thehaslings@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:54 AM
Subject: Urging a NO Vote to further deregulation

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

My husband and I urge you to vote against further deregulation of the media. As a member of the FCC, it is incumbent upon you to provide the leadership to maintain media in a way that best serves the public interest. This effort can be accomplished by making certain that a broad variety of programming plus a wide spectrum of political viewpoints are available to the citizenry of the U.S.

We certainly do not feel that this is the case at the present time. The options this weekend, for example, were limited to inane comedies, murder investigations (either fact or fiction), and news being served up as entertainment. When there is an actual event that is news, as was the capture of Eric Rudolph, it is repeated all day and all evening, almost to the exclusion of all else that is happening around the country and in the world.

The present political representation is lopsided, with right-wing programming prevailing. Having recently travelled in several European countries, we found media there (both TV and the press) with a much more balanced presentation of the news than here in the United States. There is absolutely no reason why Americans should have news with slanted content, but we do.

Please vote against further deregulation of the media.

Sincerely,
Elsie and Jack Hasling

From: Alexandratwin@aol.com
To: undisclosed-recipients, @fcc.gov
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:56 AM
Subject: no deregulation!!!

I am writing to ask you to vote NO on deregulation on June 2. Letting corporations own more media outlets stifles differing opinions and destroys democracy.

Thank you,
Alexandra Paul
Malibu, Ca (310) 573-9826

From: Groucho P.
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:59 AM
Subject: Fw: June 2 decision

----- Original Message -----

From: Groucho P.
To: mpowell@fcc.gov
Sent: Saturday, May 31, 2003 10:56 PM
Subject: June 2 decision

Dear Mr. Powell:

My family & I have listened to both sides in the debate over your proposed decision to change the laws that currently restrict ownership of various media throughout the United States. It is our informed opinion that this action would be detrimental to the pursuit of free speech and a balanced media. Already we have seen the diminishing choices available to us thanks to greater control by the few. Such changes run contrary to democracy and serve only to enhance the free speech of corporate executives, such as Rupert Murdoch. This is a political power grab, plain and simple. And the majority of Americans will see it for what it is, all rhetoric aside. Because of your phone system, it is impossible to reach the FCC by phone, but consider this email one of the many opposed to the FCC's split decision to monopolize the American media. If this issue had been debated in the open, as it should have been--given its tremendous importance--those supporting this change would find yourselves in the much-deserved minority. You guys in Washington should show more respect for the intelligence of the people, the constitution, and public-supported media, such as PBS.

Yours sincerely,
J. Palumbo

From: Groucho P.
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:59 AM
Subject: Fw: June 2 decision

----- Original Message -----

From: Groucho P.
To: mpowell@fcc.gov
Sent: Saturday, May 31, 2003 10:56 PM
Subject: June 2 decision

Dear Mr. Powell:

My family & I have listened to both sides in the debate over your proposed decision to change the laws that currently restrict ownership of various media throughout the United States. It is our informed opinion that this action would be detrimental to the pursuit of free speech and a balanced media. Already we have seen the diminishing choices available to us thanks to greater control by the few. Such changes run contrary to democracy and serve only to enhance the free speech of corporate executives, such as Rupert Murdoch. This is a political power grab, plain and simple. And the majority of Americans will see it for what it is, all rhetoric aside. Because of your phone system, it is impossible to reach the FCC by phone, but consider this email one of the many opposed to the FCC's split decision to monopolize the American media. If this issue had been debated in the open, as it should have been--given its tremendous importance--those supporting this change would find yourselves in the much-deserved minority. You guys in Washington should show more respect for the intelligence of the people, the constitution, and public-supported media, such as PBS.

Yours sincerely,
J. Palumbo

From: Phil Abrahamson
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:01 AM
Subject: please do NOT change media ownership rules

The strength of our democracy lies in an educated, well-informed public. Critical to this education is the opportunity for citizens to hear a wide variety of voices and opinions. I believe that media ownership is already far too consolidated. Please do not allow further consolidation.

It doesn't matter whether the media conglomerates are left-leaning, right-leaning, or centric - when the number of separate voices shrinks, our democracy suffers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Philip G. Abrahamson
46 Douglass Way
Atherton, CA 94027
650-326-2767

From: kyle lucas
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, jadelste@fcc.com
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:04 AM
Subject: Please vote AGAINST media ownership proposal

FCC Chairman and Commissioners,

While I do not have much confidence that any of President Bush's appointments cares much about comments from anyone other than the President himself and those to whom he owes favors, I would nevertheless ask that you accept the following public comment relating to your decision Monday whether to relax FCC rules on network ownership:

Simply put, allowing media companies to own more tv/radio stations and newspapers (and related additional "cross-ownership" of media outlets) is an unacceptable attack on one of the central pillars supporting our great nation's democracy - it's belief that the dissemination of divergent views and opinions, from independent sources, is essential to maintaining freedom of speech. In the past year, those who have been paying attention have seen a disconcerting increase in media stifling of divergent views and "unpopular" opinions, from biased television war coverage to media-giant Clear Channel's treatment of the Dixie Chicks. This proposal acts as a governmental stamp of approval for further media censorship.

Clearly, the media giants who stand to benefit from this proposal are friends of the administration, and of the FCC. Otherwise, this proposal would never have come to fruition. Once they have monopolized markets, will they have any incentive to publish or air opinions contrary to administration views? Not if they wish to remain on good terms with the administration.

Please do not allow the influence of a few power-hungry executives, and their hard-working lobbyist in the White House, to overcome common sense, and the overwhelming majority of public opinion.

Respectfully,
Kyle Lucas, concerned citizen

From: Joseph Slavin
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:40 AM
Subject: Monday's Vote

Dear Kathleen,

I ask you to please vote against the liberalization of the ownership laws.

The more voices we have the better. The less control of the voice we hear the better.

Don't be deceived thinking that other laws or agencies will look out for our rights. It is you, at this time who has to do the right thing.

Kathleen, please help the all the voices to be heard.

A Patriot

From: Driveynyc@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:52 AM
Subject: ownership rule change

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

Please, please do not destroy the free press in this country. The proposed rule change will begin the downfall of American democracy and sow the insidious seed of dictatorship.

We must have news that is not edited and manipulated by large corporations or political parties.

You should be bringing charges against Clear Channel for already having a monopoly in many markets. This is anti-American, and your proposed rule change is anti-American. It violates the guarantee of a free press.

Sincerely,
Ms. Dana Ivey
514 West End Avenue
New York, NY 10024

From: Mitch Besser
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:53 AM
Subject: Money

Hey Guys,

I heard it's likely you will loosen restrictions on corporate ownership of the media. I hope you got a lot of money for selling the US citizens down the river. If you ever need any help in the future, give me a call. I'll be sure to hang up on you promptly.

Mitch

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

From: Bill Brooksher
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:56 AM
Subject: consolidation vote

A short message to ask you not to allow further consolidation of our media outlets. I won't go into detail other than to say it is in the interest of all to have a diverse source of news and entertainment. Thank you.

Bill Brooksher
974 Virginia Ave
Gainesville, GA 30501
770-534-5958

From: Roni Bourque
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:00 AM
Subject: Heard you comments on the news.

NOW IS THE TIME TO STOP "THEM" FROM GETTING ANY BIGGER. IF YOU BELIEVE WHAT YOU SAID ABOUT THE FCC TELLING THE CORPORATIONS WHEN THEY'RE GETTING TOO BIG THEN WHY AREN'T YOU AWARE THAT THEY ARE ALREADY TOO BIG. THERE ARE ONLY 7 CORPORATIONS CONTROLLING ALL MOVIES, TV PROGRAMMING, PRINT AND RADIO MEDIA. AREN'T "THEY" ALREADY TOO BIG? OR ARE YOU GOING TO TRY TO STOP THEM WHEN THERE ARE ONLY 3 CORPORATION AND HUNDREDS MORE AMERICANS HAVE LOST THEIR JOBS BECAUSE OF CONSOLIDATIONS. PLEASE DON'T SUPPORT THE DISAPPEARING DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA. VOTE NO TO ANY MORE CONSOLIDATION OF MEDIA CORPORATIONS.

From: Roni Bourque
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:13 AM
Subject: THANK YOU!

THANK YOU FOR GIVING THE AMERICAN PUBLIC THE FORUM AND THE OPPORTUNITY
TO HEAR THE TRUTH. HOPE ABERNATHY, POWELL AND MARTIN GET A CONSCIENCE,
COLLECTIVE OR OTHERWISE AND VOTE NO.
R. BOURQUE

From: Douglas Rook
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 3:27 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Douglas Rook (doug-rook@webtv.net) writes:

Please vote against more media concentration. After 35 years of work and study in telecommunications, I find it incredible that this even being considered. Look at the Minot incident where Clear Channel controlled 6 of the 7 radio stations and the emergency notification system failed. Are hundreds of automated radio stations in my best interest, convenience and necessity? How will more media concentration improve my life? Will I get to watch even more program length commercials as these media giants get fatter and my broadcast options get THINNER. Please vote your conscience and do what would be best for your grandmother and not some media mogul. Thank you.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.240.198.63
Remote IP address: 209.240.198.63

From: Jljonesk@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, kabernat@fcc.gov..fcc.gov, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:05 AM
Subject: NO to relaxing ownership rules

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Abernathy, Copps, Martin and Adelstein:

I urge you all to vote NO on the proposal to relax ownership rules for the communications industry which is scheduled for your vote on Monday, June 2nd.

Relaxing these long standing rules would make media consolidation and monopolies inevitable. Indeed, the dominance of mega-corporations over the cable, broadcast & printnews industries has already substantially skewed information, entertaining and advertising available to the public. Has the phrase, "in the public interest" lost all meaning? I hope not -- as I believe the keys to a healthy democracy, namely, freedom of speech, diversity and individualism are at stake.

At the very least, please, please, postpone your ruling to a date later enough so that there can be a real, viable public dialogue on this crucially important issue. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Johanna Lisa Jones
933 E. Seneca St.
Tucson, AZ 85719
ph: (520) 622 1682

< jljonesk@aol.com >

From: c chris
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:37 AM
Subject: June 2nd keep our children's future in mind VOTE NO

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am deeply concerned with the proposed relaxation of media ownership rules and appeal to you to vote against this. The American public needs to be brought into this discussion.

A healthy democracy is best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. It is imperative that we preserve this crucial element of America, now and for the generations to come. Please vote no, you hold the future for our children and their opportunities at hand. Don't close them off by making such a shortsighted vote. Give them a chance to grow, to learn and to have a voice... VOTE NO.

Most Sincerely,
Chris Carlson

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

From: Ann Stephens
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:54 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Ann Stephens (astephens@acchase.com) writes:

Thank you for voting against relaxing ownership rules for the U.S. airwaves. You are one of the few who understands that your job is to protect the public. I am the public.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 165.247.94.82
Remote IP address: 165.247.94.82

From: mjay1029@yahoo.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 5:03 AM
Subject: Lifting Ownership Caps

Hello,

I'm sending this email in regards of the FCC lifting ownership caps for owners. I am against this ruling, I believe the ownership caps should be shorten for only one owner to have 1 AM and 1 FM and 1 TV station. That way it can be a diverse, balanced, and competitive media instead on conglomerate companies such as Clear Channel to take over the media, and have a chance for minority owners for a chance at ownership of Radio & TV.

We allow media companies to use the airwaves in exchange for their assurance that they're serving the public interest, and it's your job as the FCC to make sure that's so. I pray that you all make the right decision and lower the ownership caps instead of increasing them, because if this happens it will major disaster in media where companies will control what we watch on TV and what we hear on the radio. So I beg you Please! don't not do this.

Thanks for your time.

MJ Johnson

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

From: Robert Owen
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 5:19 AM
Subject: The Vote

Dear Mr. Chairman,

You are scheduled to vote on Monday on rule changes regarding broadcast ownership. This could be the most significant vote in the history of the FCC and most certainly will be your own personal legacy. This is not a vote to take lightly. I own a broadcast services and production company in Atlanta. At the ripe old age of 50, I have been in radio and television for 32 years. It is the business I knew I would be in since I slipped a transistor radio under my pillow at age 7 to listen to Cousin Brucie on WABC in New York. It is my love and my passion. When I got in the business, in order to get your FCC license you had to memorize a lot of theory as well as a lot of law and FCC Rules. It was drummed into all of us, that broadcast stations were licensed "in the public interest". As a result of that particular rule, stations were required to program for the public good. We were required to provide diversity of opinion. What happened was simple. Smart broadcasters found out quickly that proving to the audience that you truly care about them and their community pays back in loyalty to the station and higher ratings which translate to greater revenue and higher margins.

It is well known that you have been championing the relaxation in TV ownership rules for some time. Haven't you seen what has happened in radio since the 96 Telecommunications Act? The consolidation in the industry has wiped out so much of the creativity and local commitment in radio. Just think, Mr. Chairman, the radio station you listen to in the car

Robert Owen

President

Millenia 3 Communications

945 Blackwell Trail

Marietta, GA 30066

404-982-1500 Voice

404-982-0101 FAX

robert@millenia3.com

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Jim Martin
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 6:01 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Jim Martin (jimnysf@aol.com) writes:

Please do not allow these large corporations to own any more of our media. They already have more than enough control.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 152.163.252.198
Remote IP address: 152.163.252.198

From: NMichels@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 7:33 AM
Subject: (no subject)

I do not agree with giving more control of TV to the larger media corporations.

From: Sunnybrk@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 7:36 AM
Subject: Relaxing Consolidation Rules

Dear Commissioners,

I am the Town Supervisor in a rural town in upstate NY. I remember all the benefits that were touted when electricity distribution was deregulated. However, the unintended consequence of streamlining and allowing corporate consolidation has been to reduce service and community contact, with no perceptible change in energy cost.

The most recent example was this winter when a major snow storm toppled trees and downed power lines. Our town's ability to communicate with our local electric company was only through chasing down a particular truck and asking them what they had done and where they were going next. We were very frustrated as we were trying to close and open roads with no central or coordinating office contact -- you see it was the weekend.

Our local electric carrier (NYSEG) has been bought by a large regional conglomerate (Energy East). Our Town had no lines of communication with any central office. The local NYSEG office, which was our previous contact, has been eliminated.

I raise this point because I see the same path for media consolidation. If consolidation allows these businesses to streamline, then who will be the local contact in emergencies? Will there be anyone that we can contact any time of day to pass along information critical to the health and safety of our citizens?

I own and operate a residential construction firm for the past 20 years. I look for opportunities for efficiency. I also know that regulation can add financial burden to business operation. However, in the case of media consolidation, I fail to see the financial stress that the current regulations add. I only see the opportunity for media corporations to become more streamlined and profitable at the expense of the public they serve.

Therefore, I urge you not to change the regulations regarding consolidation of media ownership.

Sincerely,
Don Barber
Supervisor
Town of Caroline

From: LifeWellDreamt@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 8:14 AM
Subject: FCC Deregulation

Please do not deregulate.

We need MORE voices out there. Not less.

Thank you,
Lois Gutterson